



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,221	10/29/2003	Craig Ogg	61135/P022US/10303187	9619
29053	7590	07/14/2011		
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P			EXAMINER	
2200 ROSS AVENUE			WU, RUTAO	
SUITE 2800				
DALLAS, TX 75201-2784				
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3628	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/14/2011	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

doipdocket@fulbright.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/696,221

Applicant(s)

OGG, CRAIG

Examiner

RUTAO WU

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 14-20, 22-29, 31-34 and 36-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 14-20, 22-29, 31-34 and 36-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12/29/2010
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No.(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. In response filed December 29, 2010, the Applicant amended claims 11, 14-20, 22-25, 31, 38, 40-42 and 44. Claims 46-50 are newly introduced. Claims 11, 14-20, 22-29, 31-34, 36-50 are pending in the current application.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 24-29, 31-34, 36-41 and 44 in the reply filed on April 18, 2011 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the groups are not independent or distinct and no serious burden exists for examining the groups together. This is found to be persuasive and the restriction requirement between Group I and Group II has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 24 and 42 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 24-29, 33, 34, 36-40 and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of U.S. Pub No 2003/0014376 to DeWitt et al in further view of U.S. Pub No 2005/0077346 to Dutta et al.

Referring to claim 24:

A method for creating postage stamps for use on mail pieces, comprising:

Ogg et al disclose

Calculating a postage amount due for each of the mail pieces; [0031], [0032]

Printing, by a printer on blank labels, the valid postage labels comprising postage indicia corresponding to the postage amount calculated for the mail pieces [0031]-[0036] and

Applying the valid postage labels to the associated mail pieces. [0026]

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose

Creating valid postage labels associated with each of the mail pieces before the mail pieces arrive at a location comprising postage stamp applicator;

DeWitt et al disclose creating valid postage labels associated with each of the mail pieces before the mail pieces arrive at a location comprising postage stamp applicator; [0086]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by DeWitt et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination creating postage labels with matching serial

numbers as disclosed by Ogg et al and the high-speed mail processing system of DeWitt et al would have continued to perform the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the postage label does not display the permit information in the human readable portion of the postage label.

Dutta et al disclose a permit mail system wherein the human readable portion of the postage label does not include permit information. (Fig 2; [0008])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the permit mail information encoding feature as disclosed by Dutta et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 25:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 further comprising:

Monitoring the quality of the valid postage labels to ensure that the proper postage valid postage labels were printed [0040]

Referring to claim 26:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose monitoring the quality of the mail pieces to ensure that the valid postage labels have been properly applied.

DeWitt et al disclose monitoring the quality of the mail pieces to ensure that the valid postage labels have been properly applied. [0095]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by DeWitt et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination creating postage labels with matching serial numbers as disclosed by Ogg et al and the high-speed mail processing system of DeWitt et al would have continued to perform the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 27:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose

Monitoring the quality of the mail pieces to ensure that the postage indicia represents a proper postage amount. [0032]

DeWitt et al disclose monitoring the quality of the mail pieces to ensure that the postage indicia represents a proper postage amount. [0095]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by DeWitt et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination creating postage labels with matching serial numbers as disclosed by Ogg et al and the high-speed mail processing system of DeWitt et al would have continued to perform the same function as it did separately.

Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 28:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the calculating step further comprises:

Determining a destination for a mail piece; (Fig 4)

Calculating the postage amount based upon the destination of the mail piece

[0031]

Referring to claim 29:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the calculating step further comprises:

Determining a weight for a mail piece;[0032]

Calculating the postage amount based upon the weight of the mail piece. [0032]

Referring to claim 33:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the blank labels comprise a roll of blank labels that are printed in series. [0035]

Referring to claim 34:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the blank labels comprise a sheet of blank labels. [0035]

Referring to claim 36:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the blank labels comprise a serial number.

[0036]

Referring to claim 37:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 36 further comprising:

Verifying that the serial number is valid. [0039]

Referring to claim 38:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 36 wherein the printed postage indicia includes the serial number. (Fig 6)

Referring to claim 39:

Ogg et al disclose

The method of claim 24 wherein the printing step further comprises:

Receiving label stock having a pre-printed serial number, the pre-printed serial number including a master serial number; [0036]

Generating postage indicia using the master serial number, pre-printed serial number, and required request; [0036] and

Printing the postage indicia on the label stock. [0036]

Referring to Claim 40:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose verifying that the correct valid postage labels are applied to each mail piece.

DeWitt et al disclose coordinating the operation of the postage stamp applicator and the location of the mail piece to ensure that the correct valid postage labels are applied to each envelope. [0081]-[0083]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by DeWitt et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination creating postage labels with matching serial numbers as disclosed by Ogg et al and the high-speed mail processing system of DeWitt et al would have continued to perform the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claim 44:

Ogg et al disclose the method of claim 24 wherein the valid postage labels display a postage amount in an increment that is available from the delivery service. (Fig 3, Fig 6)

6. Claims 31, 32 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pub No. 2002/0073039 to Ogg et al in view of U.S. Pub No. 2001/0037320 to Allport et al in further view of U.S. Pub No 2003/0014376 to DeWitt et al in further view of Dutta et al.

Referring to claim 31:

Ogg et al disclose printing an image on the blank labels, wherein each of the postage indicia are associated with a mail piece that is designated for a particular recipient; [0037]

Ogg et al does not expressly disclose wherein the image is selected based upon one or more characteristics of the particular recipient.

Allport et al disclose printing a postage indicia label wherein the image is selected based upon one or more characteristics of the particular recipient. [0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the image selection for postal indicia as discloses by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 32:

Ogg et al disclose each of the postage stamps are associated with a mail piece that is designated for a particular recipient;(Fig 9 and 10) Ogg et al does not expressly disclose that the image is selected based upon a characteristic of the recipient, and the characteristics are selected from the group consisting of:

The recipient's age;

The recipient's sex;

The recipient's occupation; and

The recipient's location.

Allport et al disclose selecting an image basing upon a characteristic of the recipient wherein the characteristics are selected from the group consisting of: the recipient's sex, the recipient's location. [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the image selection based on certain recipient characteristics as discloses by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claim 41:

Ogg et al disclose printing an image on the blank labels, wherein each of the postage indicia are associated with a mail piece that is designated for a particular recipient; [0037]

Ogg et al does not expressly disclose wherein each of the valid postage labels comprise an image and each of the image is selected based on recipient characteristics of a particular one of the mail pieces.

Allport et al disclose printing a postage indicia label wherein the image is selected based upon one or more characteristics of the particular recipient. [0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the image selection for postal

indicia as discloses by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

7. Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Allport et al in view of Beaudoin et al in further view of U.S. Pat No 4,876,000 to Mkihail.

Referring to Claim 42:

Creating a machine generated postage stamp, by a high speed mail item computer processing system, said creating including:

Ogg et al disclose

Receiving, by the mail item computer processing system, information associated with each of a plurality of mail pieces, wherein the mail item computer processing system determines a postage amount for each postage indicia to be printed based on the information; [0026], [0031]-[0033] and

Printing, by a printer, said machine generated postage stamp including a postage indicium and an image, wherein the postage indicium is associated with a particular one of the plurality of mail pieces and bears the determined postage amount, [0031]-[0036]

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the image is selected based on characteristics of a recipient of the particular one of the plurality of mail pieces;

Allport et al disclose that images can be selected and printed as part of the postage indicia where the image varies based on certain recipient characteristics. [0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to vary the images printed on the plurality of labels as disclosed by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting the image would have functions the same as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable. and

Ogg et al disclose affixing the machine generated postage stamp to the mail pieces [0026] Ogg et al does not expressly disclose affixing the machine generated postage stamp to the mail piece to provide mail pieces processed by the high speed mail item computer processing system that have the appearance of a mail piece comprising a postage stamp that was obtained from a delivery service and was applied by hand.

Beaudoin et al disclose applying, by a high speed mail item processing computer system, said valid postage labels to said particular one of the plurality of mail pieces, wherein said mail pieces have an appearance of a mail item comprising a postage stamp that was obtained from a delivery service that was applied by hand, wherein said appearance of said mail item comprising a postage stamp that was obtained from a delivery service and was applied by hand is achieved at least in part by said valid

postage labels being formatted as said postage stamp that was obtained from said delivery service. (col 4: lines 4-14; col 5: lines 25-39)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to incorporate the high-speed letter processing system as disclosed by Beaudoin et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. In the present invention, the monitoring, determining, printing and applying postage indicia steps disclosed by Ogg et al will be performed the same when combined into a high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by Beaudoin et al, thus one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Ogg et al and Beaudoin et al do not expressly disclose wherein the machine generated postage stamp is at least two separate labels appearing to be at least two different postage stamps which display postage amounts in increments that are offered by the delivery service and the at least two postage amounts displayed by the at least two separate labels total at least the determined postage amount.

Mikhail disclose the feature of having at least two postage stamps displaying postage amounts in increments that are offered by the delivery service and the at least two postage amounts displayed by the at least two separate labels total at least the determined postage amount. (col 2: lines 29-33)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the feature of having a

plurality of stamps on a mail piece which total at least the determine postage amount appropriate for the mail piece as disclosed by Miki hail since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to Claim 43:

Ogg et al disclose at least two of the machine generated postage stamp bear different postage amounts [0031], Ogg et al do not expressly disclose the method of claim 42 wherein at least two of the machine generated postage stamp bear different images and different postage amounts.

Allport et al disclose machine generated postage stamp bear different images and different postage amounts. [0028], [0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to vary the images printed on the plurality of labels as disclosed by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting different mage would have functions the same as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable

8. Claim 45 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Allport et al in view of Beaudoin et al in view of Mkihail in further view of Dutta et al.

Referring to Claim 45:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein no human readable portions of said valid postage labels display permit information.

Dutta et al disclose a permit mail system wherein the human readable portion of the postage label does not include permit information. (Fig 2; [0008])

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the permit mail information encoding feature as disclosed by Dutta et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

9. Claims 11, 15, 20, 22, 23 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Mkihail.

Referring to Claim 46:

An mail processing system comprising:

Ogg et al disclose

A controller operable to receive information associated with each respective mail piece of a plurality of mail pieces, wherein the received information is used by the

controller to determine a required amount of postage for said each respective mail piece. [0031]-[0034]

A postage evidencing system operable to print a postage label for a particular mail piece of the plurality of mail pieces;[0037]

An applicator operable to apply the postage label to the particular mail piece. [0037]

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the postage label comprises at least two postage stamps which display postage amounts that total at least the determined required amount of postage.

Mikhail disclose the feature of having at two separate labels on a mailpiece that total at least the determined postage amount. (col 2: lines 29-33)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the feature of having a plurality of stamps on a mail piece which total at least the determine postage amount appropriate for the mail piece as disclosed by Mikhail since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 11:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 46 wherein the received information associated with said each respective mail piece comprises a required postage amount. [0031]

Referring to claim 15:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 46 wherein the postage evidencing system is operable to print a plurality of postage labels wherein a single image is printed on the plurality of valid postage labels; and wherein the plurality of valid postage labels are printed with indicia representing at least two different postage amounts.(Fig 6)

Referring to claim 20:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 46 wherein a blank printing medium upon which the valid postage labels are printed comprise a serial number. [0036]

Referring to claim 22:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 20 wherein the printed postage indicia includes the serial number. [0036]

Referring to claim 23:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 46 wherein the postage evidencing system is operable to:
Receive label stock having a pre-printed serial number, the pre-printed serial number including a master serial number; [0036]

Generate the valid postage label using the master serial number, pre-printed serial number, and determined required amount of postage [0036]; and

Print the valid postage label comprising the postage stamps. [0036]

10. Claims 14, 16, 17 and 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Mkihail in further view of Allport.

Referring to Claim 47:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein at least one of the two postage stamps comprise an image selected based upon one or more characteristics of a recipient of the particular mail piece;

Allport et al disclose that images can be selected and printed as part of the postage indicia where the image varies based on certain recipient characteristics. [0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to vary the images printed on the plurality of labels as disclosed by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting the image would have functions the same as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 14:

Ogg et al disclose each of the postage stamps are associated with a mail piece that is designated for a particular recipient;(Fig 9 and 10) Ogg et al does not expressly disclose that the image is selected based upon a characteristic of the recipient, and the characteristics are selected from the group consisting of:

The recipient's age;

The recipient's sex;

The recipient's occupation; and

The recipient's location.

Allport et al disclose selecting an image basing upon a characteristic of the recipient wherein the characteristics are selected from the group consisting of: the recipient's sex, the recipient's location. [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to combine the image selection based on certain recipient characteristics as discloses by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting the image would have functions the same as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 16:

Ogg et al disclose wherein the postage indicia printed on a plurality of valid postage labels represent a single postage amount. [0037] Ogg et al does not expressly disclose wherein the plurality of valid postage labels are printed with varying images.

Allport et al disclose that images can be selected and printed as part of the postage indicia where the image varies based on certain recipient characteristics.

[0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to vary the images printed on the plurality of labels as disclosed by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting the image would have functions the same as it did separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 17:

Ogg et al disclose wherein the determined required amount of postage vary based on weight and recipient location [0033]. Ogg et al does not expressly disclose that the images on the labels also vary.

Allport et al disclose that images can be selected and printed as part of the postage indicia where the image varies based on certain recipient characteristics.

[0029], [0032]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to vary the images printed on the plurality of labels as disclosed by Allport et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the element of printing postage indicia and the element of selecting the image would have functions the same as it did

separately, and one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

11. Claim 48 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Mkihail in further view of DeWitt.

Referring to Claim 48:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose verifying the postage label is properly applied to the particular mail piece.

DeWitt et al disclose coordinating the operation of the postage stamp applicator and the location of the mail piece to ensure that the correct valid postage labels are applied to each envelope. [0081]-[0083]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by DeWitt et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination creating postage labels with matching serial numbers as disclosed by Ogg et al and the high-speed mail processing system of DeWitt et al would have continued to perform the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

12. Claim 49 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Mkihail in further view of U.S. Pat No 6,520,342 to Dumke et al.

Referring to Claim 49:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose rejecting a particular mail piece if the postage label is not properly applied.

Dumke et al disclose a product label handling system wherein the system verifies if a label is properly applied to the item and treat the item accordingly. (col 19: lines 50-60)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to incorporate the label verification feature as disclosed by Dumke et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

13. Claims 18, 19 and 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogg et al in view of Mkihail in further view of Beaudoin et al.

Referring to Claim 50:

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the particular mail piece has an appearance of a mail item comprising a mail stamp that was obtained from a delivery service and was applied by hand,

Beaudoin et al disclose a mailing system wherein said mail pieces have an appearance of a mail item comprising a postage stamp that was obtained from a delivery service that was applied by hand, wherein said appearance of said mail item

comprising a postage stamp that was obtained from a delivery service and was applied by hand is achieved at least in part by said valid postage labels being formatted as said postage stamp that was obtained from said delivery service. (col 4: lines 4-14; col 5: lines 25-39)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to incorporate the high-speed letter processing system as disclosed by Beaudoin et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. In the present invention, the monitoring, determining, printing and applying postage indicia steps disclosed by Ogg et al will be performed the same when combined into a high-speed mail processing system as disclosed by Beaudoin et al, thus one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 18:

Ogg et al disclose the system of claim 46 wherein the valid postage labels are printed on a printing medium comprising a roll of blank labels that are printing in series, [0035]

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the roll of printed valid postage labels appears to be a roll of postage stamps.

Beaudoin et al disclose a high speed printing device for printing postage indicia on labels with a look and feel of a conventional United States postage stamp. (col 4: lines 4-14; col 5: lines 25-39)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the look and feel of the postage label as disclosed by Beaudoin et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the printing element and the making the postage label look like a United States postage stamp merely would have performed the same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Referring to claim 19:

Ogg et al disclose

The system of claim 46 wherein the valid postage labels are printed on a printing medium comprising a sheet of blank labels, [0035]

Ogg et al do not expressly disclose wherein the sheet of printed valid postage labels appears to be a sheet of postage stamps.

Beaudoin et al disclose a high speed printing device for printing postage indicia on labels with a look and feel of a conventional United States postage stamp. (col 4: lines 4-14; col 5: lines 25-39)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for Ogg et al to include the look and feel of the postage label as disclosed by Beaudoin et al since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination the printing element and the making the postage label look like a United States postage stamp merely would have performed the

same function as it did separately. Therefore, one ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RUTAO WU whose telephone number is (571)272-3136. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571)272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/RUTAO WU/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3628